

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/777,260	GARROW, ZACHARY ADAM	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MELVIN H. POLLACK	2445	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) MELVIN H. POLLACK. (3)_____.

(2) Owen Gamon (36,143). (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 14 October 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Singleton et al. (2004/0019724), Ramakesavan(2003/0065734), Huber (7,197,584).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant desired to focus on the physical embodiments of the invention, with particular focus on the hinge (as opposed to a dock) being attached to the lid (as distinct from the base) such that it may rotate to specific positions, the purpose being that the PDA display is visible at all times and therefore never has to be detached. The proposed claims do not quite reach this level of detail.

Determination of an allowance based on sufficient detail of a physical realm requires consultation with a mechanical art expert. In the meantime, the applicant is reminded that a 103 rejection is based on what is suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art. Because of the breadth of physical embodiments disclosed in the three pieces of art, one can easily form a rejection for a wide variety of physical embodiments, particularly in light of KSR.

Therefore, no agreement of allowance is reached. Proposed amendment was entered.